DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 762 SP 033 651

AUTHOR Hafner, Anne L.; Green, Jennie Spencer
TITLE Multicultural Education and Diversity: Providing Information to Teachers.
PUB DATE Feb 92
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (San Antonio, TX, February 25-28, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Limited English Speaking; *Multicultural Education; Schools of Education; Second Language Instruction; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS Arizona; California; Nevada

ABSTRACT

Institutions of higher education in the western part of the United States have begun to respond to the challenges faced by teachers working with students from diverse cultural and ethnolinguistic backgrounds. To establish the extent to which institutions offer inservice courses related to multilingual settings, the METRO Center at the Southwest Regional Laboratory launched a project to collect and distribute information to teachers and other school personnel about the typical courses and inservice staff development activities currently offered by colleges, universities, and county offices of education in California, Arizona, and Nevada. A guide was developed that provides information to teachers about courses designed to increase their knowledge and ability to deliver instruction to students with limited English proficiency (LEP). In developing the guide, teacher needs as well as effective strategies for teaching LEP students were identified, the types of courses and training currently offered to teachers were described, and course features were summarized for two areas, Los Angeles County (California) and Arizona. Course and training features were then compared with previously identified teacher needs. The major unmet needs of teachers are skills in integrating academic content knowledge with English language development, developing literacy skills, and in assessing student language proficiency in students' native language and English, as well as knowledge of subject matter and first and second language acquisition. Implications for administrators of teacher training institutions and providers of inservice programs are discussed. (Author/IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED342762

Multicultural Education and Diversity:

Providing Information to Teachers

Anne L. Hafner
Southwest Regional Laboratory

Jennie Spencer Green
Southwest Regional Laboratory

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Hafner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, San Antonio, February 1992.

SP033651

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper was developed under a subcontract from the Far West Laboratory operating under a contract it holds with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement. However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of Far West Lab nor of the Department of Education, and endorsements of the contents by either should not be assumed.

Abstract

There is a growing imbalance between the racial, cultural and linguistic composition of the K-12 student population and the teacher workforce, which remains largely Anglo and English-speaking. Institutions of higher education throughout the Western region have begun to respond to the challenges faced by teachers working with students from diverse cultural and ethnolinguistic backgrounds. To establish the extent to which institutions offer inservice courses related to multilingual settings, the METRO Center at the Southwest Regional Laboratory launched a project to collect and distribute information to teachers and other school personnel about the typical courses and inservice staff development activities currently offered by colleges, universities and county offices of education in California, Arizona and Nevada. A guide was developed that provides information to teachers about courses designed to increase their knowledge and ability to deliver instruction to LEP students. Teacher needs in this area as well as effective strategies were identified , the types of courses and training currently offered to teachers were described, and course features summarized for two areas, Los Angeles County and Arizona. Course and training features were then compared with previously identified teacher meeds. Teacher needs in two out of five areas identified were found to be not well met, and needs in the remaining three areas were only moderately well met. The major unmet needs of teachers are skills in integrating academic content knowledge with English language development, in developing literacy skills, and in assessing student language proficiency in students' native language and English, as well as knowledge of subject matter and first and second language acquisition. Implications for administrators of teacher training institutions and providers of inservice programs are discussed.

Introduction and Objectives

Continuous changes in the student population have significantly affected America's public schools over the past 10 years. Specifically, Arizona, California, and Nevada's student populations have become more racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse. In the 1989-90 school year, ethnic minorities comprised approximately one third of Arizona's 618,226 students. In addition, 59,913 or 10% of the students in Arizona were considered limited English proficient (LEP) (Arizona Department of Education, 1990). In 1991, 23% of Nevada's 210,741 public school students were minorities, and approximately 9,000 or 4% of the students in Nevada were considered to be LEP (Nevada Department of Education, 1991). California has the nation's largest minority and LEP student populations, and language minority (LM)/LEP students represent the fastest-growing student population in California. Minorities make up nearly 50% of the state's 4,400,000 students. LEP students are currently estimated to make up about 20% of California's student population (about 861,000), and about 90 different minority languages are spoken (Smith, Anderson & Sobul, 1991).

Change in the population makeup in these states has resulted in a growing imbalance between the racial, cultural, and ethnolinguistic composition of the K-12 student population and the teacher workforce, which remains largely Anglo and English-speaking (California Tomorrow, 1990). For example, in California, 81% of teachers are white, 7% are Hispanic, 3% are Asian, 6% are black, and 3% are classified as other. Further, most teachers have been prepared to provide instruction only in English and do not have the academic preparation, professional experience, or skills required to enable them to provide effective instruction in ethnolinguistically diverse classrooms, particularly in academic content areas.

With the increasing numbers of LEP students, the shortage of teachers qualified to teach language minority students in their own language has become a serious problem. For example, in California about two thirds of language minority students are considered to be LEP. In 1991, 861,000 students were labelled as LEP, while only about 8,000 teachers held bilingual credentials. This gives an LEP student-credentialled teacher ratio of 108 children to each qualified teacher (861,000 : 8000). There are almost no teachers credentialled in Cambodian (0), Hmong (1), Japanese (11), Lao (2), or Mandarin (13). In addition, there are no signs of any increase in the number of bilingual teachers (California Department of Education <CDE>, 1991).

No bilingual credentials are given in Nevada, thus no statistics are available on the number of bilingual teachers. In Arizona, in the 1989-90 school year, 814 teachers held the bilingual endorsement (credential) (Arizona Department of Education, 1990). This gives an LEP student-credentialled bilingual teacher ratio of 74 children to each qualified teacher (59,913 : 814).

There appears to be a decrease in the supply of teachers and teacher candidates for most languages. In 1987, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialling issued a statement warning that the shortage of bilingual teachers reached an emergency stage and imploring universities and school districts to prepare more bilingual teachers. However, according to documents produced by the CDE-produced documents, the percentage of language certified teachers fell from 1988 to 1990, and the percentage of teachers in training for language certification also fell during this period (CDE, 1990). For example, the percentage of teachers certified in Korean fell by 26%, and the percentage of teachers certified in Vietnamese fell by 12%.

Research on new teachers' entry into teaching shows that even good pre-service programs cannot fully prepare prospective teachers for the demands of full-time teaching (see Borko, 1986). The ordinary challenges faced by these new teachers increase greatly when their teaching assignments are in classes with LEP students who speak several different languages. For example, in 1990 in the Anaheim (CA) Union School District 63 languages were spoken, including Spanish, Tagalog, Pilipino, Burmese, Vietnamese, Croation, Samoan, and Thai.

Over the past four to five years, institutions of higher education (IHEs) throughout the region have begun to respond to the challenges faced by teachers working with students from diverse cultural and ethnolinguistic backgrounds. Institutions of higher education have established special bilingual and language development certificate programs; infused multicultural perspectives into the academic disciplines; and incorporated classes that deal with diversity, bilingual instruction, bilingual curriculum materials, ESL methods and multicultural/diverse populations into their teacher-education program.

To establish the extent to which institutions offer in-service courses related to multilingual settings, the Metropolitan Educational Trends and Research Outcomes (METRO) Center at Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL) launched a project to collect and distribute information to teachers and other school personnel about the typical courses and in-service staff development activities currently offered by colleges, universities, and county offices of education in Arizona, Nevada, and Southern California. *Multilingual Classroom Settings: A Directory of Postsecondary Courses for Training Opportunities*

presents information on selected university graduate coursework and staff development training typically offered by institutions in each area.

The purpose of this paper is to describe (a) the development of a survey of regional college and university course catalogs to determine the extent to which institutions offer in-service courses related to multilingual settings, multicultural education, or diversity; and (b) the development of a guide that provides information to teachers about courses designed to increase their knowledge and ability to deliver instruction to LEP students.

This paper addresses three policy/research questions:

- What information and skills do research and practice say teachers need to deliver effective instruction to LEP students and culturally diverse populations?
- What types of courses and training are currently offered to teachers in the Western region?
- Do course and training content and features address identified teacher needs and speak to the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students?

Some of these new programs and courses focus on knowledge and skills teachers need when teaching classes made up of educationally disadvantaged students. However, a teacher's university training in how to teach academic subjects to bilingual students (usually Spanish) may not be of much help when the classroom contains students speaking three or more non-English languages. In the Western region, along with numerous classrooms primarily consisting of Spanish-speaking students, many classrooms contain ethnolinguistically diverse students. Teachers in such classrooms need to provide instruction that develops students' English language proficiency or basic literacy skills so that these students can participate in regular classes along with monolingual English students. LEP students must be helped to do better academically. Teachers' primary concern seems to be developing *basic literacy in English*, especially in the early grades.

In 1977, the National Commission on the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) mandated a diversity requirement for schools of education that offer teaching credentials. However, the requirement often is fulfilled in practice by requiring teachers in training to take one or two isolated classes. Research has shown that short courses or one-shot workshops in multicultural education, bilingual settings, and similar topics do not have lasting effects on teachers or teachers in training.

State boards of education and their teacher-credentialling agencies have tried to provide muscle to the multicultural movement. For example, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialling published *Program Standards* (CDE, 1987) to evaluate teacher

preparation programs. Several of the standards refer to language and culture issues. Relevant standards include:

- orientation to human development and equity
- preparation for multicultural education (social, cultural issues)
- readiness for diverse responsibilities (field experience)
- student rapport and classroom environment (promote multiculturalism)
- curricular and instructional planning skills (prepare lesson plans)
- presentation skills (adjust language complexity to linguistic abilities of students)
- cognitive outcomes (knowledge of assessment and appropriate uses, facilitate development of students' cognitive skills)
- affective outcomes (self esteem, attitudes)

Several of the standards mandate that a student must experience field work in schools and classrooms containing students who are culturally, linguistically and/or socio-economically different from the teacher candidate. Each teacher candidate is required to examine principles of second language acquisition and learn to use teaching strategies and curriculum materials in educating students whose primary language is not English. In addition, candidates are required to prepare at least one unit plan and several lesson plans that include objectives and materials that reflect multicultural perspectives and language acquisition strategies.

Nevada and its Commission on Professional Standards in Education has a set of licensing standards. They do not, however, address diversity issues, which are only addressed by the NCATE accrediting standards. Courses in diversity are not required by the state for certification. In Arizona, the State Board has a set of certification standards that accrediting institutions must meet, but they do not include diversity requirements.

Many of the California State University (CSU) campuses have a diversity requirement, and a similar measure is being discussed at the University of Southern California (USC) school of education. In 1991, the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) school of education instituted a requirement for all teaching credential candidates to complete a course in bilingual theory and methodology. New courses and workshops that focus on diversity and bilingual education have made their way into schools of education and into their teacher education courses. And several education schools have shown leadership in developing programs to infuse multicultural content and

processes into the teacher education curricula including undergraduate coursework (for example, San Diego State University's College of Education).

State departments of education, county offices, and school districts also have developed and implemented staff development programs to improve teacher effectiveness with LM and culturally diverse students. These courses and activities may enable teachers to provide effective instruction to an increasingly diverse, ethnolinguistic student population. Many student teachers and teachers, however, remain indifferent to or unaware of the importance of multicultural education and diversity. According to a recent national survey, only moderate interest in teaching in multicultural settings exists. Few student teachers know elementary facts about the history, culture, and the contributions of ethnic groups (Ransay, Vold, & Williams, 1989).

The first section of this paper includes a review of the literature in the areas of multiple language settings, second language development; principles of social, cultural, and communication issues around multicultural education; and identification of effective instructional strategies in bilingual settings. A summary statement concludes with the information and skills that research and practice say that teachers need to deliver effective instruction in multicultural settings.

In the second section, methods followed in carrying out this study are described, including development of a course coding scheme and grid and course feature analysis.

Findings are discussed in the following section, and implications and recommendations close the paper.

Theoretical Framework

Educational research has been somewhat successful in identifying key instructional strategies, programs, and curricula that address the needs of disadvantaged and culturally and linguistically diverse students. However, research usually focuses on a single minority language group such as Hispanics (see Castenada, 1992 for a review of the literature). But today's changing demographics create a special need for programs, practices, and curricula that address the needs of multilingual and multiethnic groups in a single classroom.

In a recent SWRL project, data on the kinds of support provided to a sample of first- and second-year teachers in 81 California metropolitan schools districts in the 1990-91 school year were analyzed (Dianda, 1991). Findings confirmed the gap between the racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity of the new teachers and their students. The students were far more diverse than their teachers.

Few (6%) of the new teachers held bilingual teaching credentials and less than 10% had other kinds of certificates (e.g., language development specialist) that qualified them to teach in language-diverse classrooms. Yet over three quarters of new teachers taught LEP students who, on average, made up about 25% of the class. Many new teachers taught classes in which students spoke one (41%) or two (22%) languages other than English. Twelve percent taught in classes in which at least five non-English languages were spoken. And only 26% of the new teachers report that they were sufficiently fluent in another language (most often Spanish) to use it while teaching.

Although three quarters of the new teachers indicated that their training covered issues related to teaching in diverse classrooms, only a few of them indicated that this training prepared them well for such assignments. The majority indicated that they felt only moderately well-prepared. When the new teachers were asked to rate the degree to which training focused on various content areas or strategies, they assigned the highest mean rating to "being sensitive to different cultural and linguistic values and activities." The lowest mean rating was given to "designing lessons so that students acquire English language skills during content instruction" (Dianda, 1991). It appears that teachers were not given much information on *specific instructional strategies* appropriate for language-diverse classrooms (e.g., using visuals and manipulatives, using oral recitation and discussion).

The survey found that training generally focused on five key areas: (a) promoting students' English language development, (b) understanding and use of students' native language, (c) adapting curriculum and instruction to meet diverse students' needs; (d) promoting student interaction, and (e) outreach to students' parents. Training given to these teachers by their districts focused mainly on assessing students' language proficiency, working with instructional aides, relating to parents, and using information about students' culture to tailor the curriculum and instruction. Other training sessions focused on promoting self esteem and social relations and using culturally appropriate techniques.

Another research strand focuses on second language acquisition principles. Second language development researchers distinguish between two kinds of language used in school. One is contextualized language, the language of basic communication; the other is decontextualized language, the language of instruction (Olson, 1977; Snow, 1984). Cummins (1981) characterizes the first as cognitively undemanding and the second as cognitively demanding. Basic communication skills take much less time to develop because meaning conveyed by contextualized language is supported by a wide range of

nonlinguistic or paralinguistic cues (Genesee, 1984, 1987). Clues like facial expressions or hand gestures and listener reactions provide verbal and nonverbal support.

The language required to perform instructional tasks in school takes a longer time to acquire. As second language learners come into contact with more complex concepts in the content areas, they are required to learn language without the support of contextual clues. As they grow older and move from grade to grade, language complexity increases in ratio to the number of new content concepts and skills they need to master (Swain & Cummins, 1982).

Research has established that second language learners in school settings require about two to three years to acquire proficiency in second language skills and from 4 to 10 years to acquire sufficient cognitive-academic skills to score at grade level in academic achievement in the second language (Collier, 1989; Krashen & Biber, 1988; Cummins, 1981). Some variance exists in the time it will take, based on student characteristics such as prior schooling in the native language or facility in the second language. A great deal of variance exists in the time it takes LEP students to acquire sufficient cognitive-academic skills. Some of the time variance can be attributed to the type of instructional programs given to second language learners.

Additionally, many students are adept at acquiring proficiency in the receptive skills of the English language; however, proficiency in the ability to articulate and engage in active discourse with native English-only speakers is often not fully developed. Subsequently, a large number of secondary language minority students opt to enroll in courses that require a minimal amount of oral discourse and cognitive academic linguistic proficiency (Green, 1986).

Many program models exist today, including ESL, transitional bilingual education, sheltered immersion, submersion, and transitional maintenance (see Castenada, 1992). Several bilingual "methodologies" have been used, including language dominant grouping, preview/review, alternative language, and direct translation.

Drawing on research findings, we can say that the optimal school conditions for LM/LEP students revolve around the quality of instruction and the intensity of language development support provided. Intensity refers to developing second language learners' English skills to a sufficient level to function academically at grade level. The highest quality of instruction is attained when the following four elements are present: appropriate linguistic models, professionally licensed teachers, principles of effective instruction, and modified instructional environments (Dianda, 1991).

According to Hornberger (1990), there are specific activities that teachers can do that go beyond "good" teaching to incorporate good teaching for bilingual literacy.

Elementary teachers can use both content- and context-specific ways to teach linguistic minority children. The content is the child's second language and the context can be seen in terms of four themes: bilingualism, literacy, second and foreign language teaching, and the teaching of reading and writing. Hornberger gives two case studies of teachers who adapt their teaching for their students' biliterate development and in particular for the specific context of their program, school, community and school district. Strategies include both affective/experiential ones and clearly defined literacy tasks. Notes Hornberger, "In the highly complex, increasingly multicultural enrironments in which our schools are situated, we will need to allow for the greatest possible ranges of approaches for teaching of biliteracy" (1990, p. 227). Nichols suggests that although it is true that "teachers teach from within their own cultural traditions," it is possible for teachers to adopt a "'double perspective' ...which requires them to understand...the limitations of their own cultural perspectives and to appreciate separate ways of understanding the world" (Nichols, 1989).

Key instructional strategies that address the needs of culturally diverse students have been identified in the literature (see Figure 1). Figure 2 identifies instructional features that have been found to be effective in multiple language settings.

Strategies found in Figure 1 are practices that all good teachers should follow. Research in the cognitive science, educational psychology, and at-risk/disadvantaged population areas has converged on the identification of these effective and ineffective strategies.

Features highlighted in Figure 2 are derived mainly from a study of exemplary Special Alternative Instructional Programs (SAIPs) for multilingual classrooms (Tikunoff et al, 1991). The major foci are using language 1 (primary language) and language 2 (English) to integrate English language development in conjunction with content-based instruction and organizing instruction to build upon structures from LEP students' culture.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Insert Figure 2 about here

To conclude, what information and skills do research and practice say that teachers need to be effective? Tikunoff (1990) has suggested that effective instruction of enthnolinguistically diverse students requires teachers to integrate content knowledge acquisition and English language development. This means that teachers must use not only instructional practices that will help increase students' academic performance, but also that teachers' knowledge, abilities, and activities must meet diverse students' particular learning needs. Cummins (1984) maintains that LEP students can develop high English proficiency skills when three conditions are met. First, schools must reinforce students' cultural identities. Second, schools must promote the development of the communicative proficiency students bring to school through bilingual instruction. Third, schools must make instruction in English comprehensible by embedding it in a context that is meaningful to students.

SWRL's New Teacher Study (Dianda, 1991) focused on five clusters of information or skills needed by teachers to deliver effective instruction to LEPs and culturally diverse populations:

1. *Develop knowledge of techniques for developing and promoting students' English language development and academic proficiency* (e.g., how to develop literacy skills; provide English language development support; integrate academic content knowledge with English language development; knowledge of subject matter frameworks);
2. *Understand and use students' native language* (e.g., how students acquire first and second languages; teaching strategies; how to assess student language proficiency in native language and English);
3. *Adapt curriculum and instruction to meet diverse student needs* (e.g., modify curriculum; use culturally appropriate techniques such as cooperative learning and peer tutoring; use information about students' culture and learning style);
4. *Promote active student interaction* (e.g., self esteem, use of English proficient students to work with LEPs); and
5. *Outreach to parents* (e.g., how to relate to parents and coordinate home and school learning.

We have looked at strategies, information, and skills identified as critical needs of teachers of diverse students. Next, we examine the types of courses and course features currently offered to teachers in Arizona, Nevada, and Southern California. We then ascertain whether the course and training content address the identified teacher needs, as well as speak to the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Methods

Letters were sent to 31 institutions (including universities and county offices of education) in Arizona, Nevada, and Southern California. Institutions were asked to provide information (e.g., course catalogs, syllabi) on course offerings and staff development training designed to enable teachers to provide effective instruction to language minority students.

The information received was organized by geographic areas within the region so teachers can find relevant courses within easy driving distance. Geographic area guides include the following: Arizona; Nevada; Los Angeles and surrounding areas; Orange County; San Bernardino/Riverside/surrounding areas; and San Diego County. Site visits were conducted at one UC campus and one CSU campus. Telephone interviews were conducted with two county office of education staff development trainers.

A method for analyzing course content was created, which consists of a grid including course characteristics and features we identified as being relevant to multicultural education or diversity. All courses deemed relevant to teaching in an ethnically diverse elementary or secondary school classroom at the in-service level are included for each institution in the directory. Because this directory is intended for in-service needs, no undergraduate introductory-level courses are included. All of the courses were selected from current catalogues. Naturally, some courses may have been overlooked inadvertently or some institutions may have cancelled or added courses. However, institutions were provided with the opportunity to review and correct entries in the grid.

The directory is organized by institution and also by department offering the course. The guide is meant as a quick way for teachers to identify courses that they may be interested in taking and where such courses are offered.

Information for each course is provided in columns. The column on the left side of the page lists the courses, along with the following information (all in bold print);

- the course name and its catalogue number;
- the number of units/credits granted for the course; and
- whether the course is intended for elementary or secondary teachers, or both.

For efficiency and simplicity, each course listing box is followed by a grid representing a checklist of relevant course features. The grid consists of columns corresponding to a set of categories across the top of the page. Figure 3 is an example of the coursework grid.

Insert Figure 3 about here

The Xs in columns for particular courses indicate subject matter and/or activities included in the course. This enables teachers to locate courses offering one or more of these features. The checklist is not intended to be all-inclusive. It is intended to be used by teachers to scan for some of the most often-sought topics, as they may be looking for very specific areas of learning. Many course titles include a feature of interest, but this is not always the case. When more than one feature of interest is present in a course (e.g., when the course receives more than one check), the course title is not a reliable indicator of course content. Relevant course features include ESL specified, bilingual/target language instruction, multicultural/diverse populations, content area instruction, instructional methods, instructional materials, assessment, instructional theory/philosophy/ curriculum, instructional practicum/field experience, and instructional lab/obervational experience.

To ascertain whether course and training features address identified teacher and student needs, course features in two geographical areas (Los Angeles County and Arizona) were analyzed by institution type (e.g., in Los Angeles County, institution types include UC campuses, CSU campuses, other private institutions and the county education office). It should be kept in mind that this is a purposive sample of the universe of institutions in these areas.

Findings

From a total of 31 institutions contacted by mail, 27 responded for a response rate of 87%. Those institutions not responding (even with a follow-up telephone call) included two county offices and two universities.

To determine how reliable different coders were in assigning features to a particular class, a site visit was conducted at one college, California State University, Dominguez Hills. Four individuals rated one section of the course catalog for the classes in the Education Department. Out of 16 possible classes, the coders agreed that 12 out of the 16 should be coded. Subsequent discussion on criteria and scope of classes to be included led to 100% agreement on this issue.

Individual ratings of classes for the four raters were aggregated. Any cell on the grid rated by only one rater was deleted. Following this, 67 cells remained. Of the 67 cells, a majority of raters (three out of four) agreed on 58 out of the 67 cells, for an 87% agreement rate. This was judged to show relatively high inter-rater agreement.

The booklets were distributed to teachers from December 1991 to March 1992. A short teacher comment form to ascertain teacher attitudes regarding the booklet (e.g., satisfaction and usefulness) was included in the booklet.

For this paper, courses from the Los Angeles County universities and the county office of education and Arizona universities were used as a sample, to ascertain the key features or foci of courses and training. Many courses relevant to multicultural education, bilingual education, and ESL were found. Numerous graduate-level learning opportunities are available for teachers of multilingual, multi-ethnic students. Courses are offered across many disciplines, including American Indian Studies, Anthropology, Asian Studies, Chicano Studies, Curriculum and Instruction, Counseling, Education, Foreign Language, History, Humanities, Library Science, Linguistics, Navajo, Policy Studies, Psychology, Reading, Sociology, Spanish, Speech, Social Service, and Social Work.

Although many "relevant" courses are offered, a majority focus on abstract presentation of theory/philosophy or curriculum issues, with a secondary focus on multicultural/diverse populations. In both Los Angeles County and Arizona,

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

multicultural/diverse populations was the second most common feature (Los Angeles County: 63%; Arizona, 59%). Less than 10% focused on assessment issues and few had practicum/field or observational experience. (See Tables 1 and 2 for the listings of Los Angeles County and Arizona.)

Overall in Los Angeles County, 95% of courses had a focus on instructional theory or philosophy and 63% focused on multicultural/diverse populations. Similarly, in Arizona universities, 88% had a focus on instructional theory or philosophy and 59% focused on multicultural/diverse populations. In Los Angeles County, 53% focused on instructional methods, while in Arizona 47% focused on methods. Interestingly, almost half (48%) of classes in Arizona focused on bilingual education, while only 30% of classes in Los Angeles County did so. The least emphasis in both areas was given to content and

methods together (6% in Los Angeles County, 7% in Arizona) and to assessment (9% in Los Angeles County, and 9% in Arizona).

Considerable diversity exists in course features by university or university type. For example, in Los Angeles County, the UC campuses tended more than other institutions to focus on instructional methods (71% of classes) and on ESL methods (39% of classes). CSU campuses tended to focus more than other institution types on content area instruction (23% of classes), on both content and instructional methods (15%), and on bilingual education (41% of classes). Private universities focused more than other institution types on field experience (29% of classes) and on multicultural/diverse populations (69%). The three types of institutions showed about the same level of focus on instructional materials (mean of 18% of classes), assessment (mean of 9% overall) and instructional theory (mean of 95% of classes). For the overall Los Angeles County institution average, the highest emphasis was on abstract instructional theory (95%), then on multicultural/diverse populations (63%), followed by instructional methods (53%), and bilingual education (30%). The least emphasis was found on assessment (9% of classes) and on content and instructional methods combined (9%). The County Office of Education gives several classes, and these were found to focus primarily on bilingual education (75% of classes) and on instructional methods (50% of classes). Some attention was also given to multicultural /diverse populations (25%).

Insert Table 2 about here

Arizona institutions also showed considerable diversity. The University of Arizona, Tucson showed a high emphasis relative to other institutions on instructional materials (21% of classes), on field experience (21% of classes), and on multicultural/diverse populations (68% of classes). Arizona State University (ASU) showed a heavy emphasis relative to others on instructional methods (55%), and on bilingual education (70% of classes). Northern Arizona University (NAU) showed a greater focus than other state institutions on content area instruction (29%) and on both content and instructional methods (16% of classes). Overall statewide, the highest emphasis went to instructional theory (88% of classes), to multicultural/diverse populations (59%), and next to bilingual education (48%) and instructional methods (47%). The least emphasis was found on both content and methods (9%) and on assessment (12% of classes). Thus, the topical emphases were similar in both California and Arizona. Table 3 shows a summary of course features emphasized in both states.

Insert Table 3 about here

Course and training features were compared with the previously identified teacher needs that speak to the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Although the research literature and practice shows us that integrated content-based English language instruction is preferable over narrow, skills-based approaches, less than 10% of classes in either Los Angeles County or Arizona include both content and instructional methods (including ESL methods). Methods are taught in over 60% of classes. Because a majority of courses cover multicultural/diverse populations, good coverage is probably given to this topic, but this emphasis may work to the detriment of other important topics.

In California, the CSU campuses (with their emphasis on content and instructional methods and on bilingual education) seemed to provide features that speak most directly to the perceived needs of teachers of diverse student populations, while the UC campuses appeared to focus primarily on methods and to not emphasize content. In Arizona, Northern Arizona University seemed most similar to the CSU campuses in its focus on content area instruction and both content and methods. The University of Arizona focused more than other institutions on materials, field experiences, and multicultural/diverse populations. ASU gave more emphasis than other institutions to bilingual education and to instructional methods.

It should be kept in mind that different institutions serve different functions. The state universities are the most common teacher training institutions and are more tied to the real world requirements of teachers than the research universities. County offices and district training programs would be expected to focus training on bilingual issues, multicultural concerns, and methods for classroom use. They would not be expected to cover instructional theory, content, or ESL methods.

How well do course and training content and features address identified teacher needs and needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students? We return to SWRL's five clusters of information and skills and knowledge needed by teacher to deliver effective instruction to LEPs and culturally diverse populations (Dianda, 1991).

The first cluster, develop students' English language and academic proficiency, includes such subskills as techniques to develop literacy skills and integrating academic content knowledge with English language development. In this cluster, the teacher is seen as an academic coach and subject matter expert. Because content area instruction and

content plus instructional methods were the focus of few in-service courses, the teacher needs in this area appear to be not well-met.

In the second area, understanding and using students' native language, subskills include knowledge of a language other than English and knowing how to assess student language proficiency. We have seen that, in the Western region few teachers are bilingual. In addition, assessment is covered in less than 10% of in-service classes in Los Angeles County and Arizona institutions. Although SWRL found that a majority of new teachers were given training in assessing students' language proficiency either by their district or New Teacher Program, it appears that current teachers may not have access to such training. Thus, the teacher needs in this area are not well-met.

In the third area, adapting curriculum and instruction to meet diverse student needs, subskills include knowing how to use culturally appropriate techniques and using information about students' culture to modify the curriculum. As found in the California New Teacher Project, new teachers said their training showed a strong focus on "being sensitive to different cultural and linguistic values and activities." In addition, about 60% of Los Angeles County and Arizona institutions' classes focused on multicultural/diverse populations. Thus, this teacher need could be considered to be moderately well-met by courses and training.

The fourth area, promoting cooperation, social interaction, and self esteem is somewhat related to multicultural/diverse populations. Thus, it also could be considered to be moderately well-met.

The last domain, outreach to parents, which includes how to relate to culturally diverse parents, is also related to the third and fourth areas and to the topic of multicultural/diverse populations. It can be considered to be moderately well-met (although information on this particular topic area was not included in the coursework grid).

The major unmet needs of teachers, then, are techniques to develop literacy skills and language development, to integrate academic content knowledge with English language development, and to assess student language proficiency in students' native language and English, as well as knowledge of subject matter and first and second language acquisition.

Educational Implications

Although diversity and multicultural education are popular themes now in the education community, it has not been well-known how widely available courses are in these areas. In addition, the characteristics of such courses are unknown. Course catalog descriptions are of necessity short and sketchy. An attempt was made in this study to

descriptions are of necessity short and sketchy. An attempt was made in this study to augment the course catalog descriptions by course feature analysis.

The study found that teacher needs in the area of sensitivity to different cultural and linguistic values and using information about students' culture to tailor the curriculum and instruction were fairly well-met. However, teacher needs in the areas of specific instructional strategies and integration of academic content knowledge with English language development appropriate for language diverse classrooms are not well-met at present.

California has made strides in formulating content area frameworks (e.g., math, social studies, science, language arts) that describe the knowledge and skills necessary for academic advancement. Its bilingual education office vigorously promotes the case for content-based primary language instruction, arguing that exemplary bilingual education is content-based. The bilingual curriculum of a district or school should be aligned with the mainstream curriculum in each subject area to guarantee that LEP students receive the same subject matter content as other students (CDE, 1990).

Some brief recommendations to administrators of teacher training institutions and providers of in-service programs can be made. First, teachers in programs and classes designed to prepare them for teaching in multilingual classes should be provided with the knowledge and skills identified as being critical in their training. Second, an in-depth analysis should be made of the the makeup of course requirement for teaching credentials and masters programs so that relevant coures are not just "add-ons" to the program. More attention should be given to content area instruction and to the integration of content and instructional methods, as well as to assessment of LEP students. Teachers need a more well-rounded preparation for teaching diverse populations than they have previously received, and need to develop a larger knowledge base of the dynamics of teaching in a pluralistic society. And those already teaching may need even more help.

SWRL is planning a summer workshop/language academy for summer 1992. The event will bring together professors who teach multicultural classes; deans of teacher education institutions; and leading scholars, researchers, and practitioners in this field. The workshop will be designed to share the results of this study, as well as to share or teach new and effective approaches.

This study has contributed to the clarification of which elements of multicultural education/diversity classes are most commonly presented and which teacher and student needs are met and unmet. These data can be used by administrators of teacher education programs and by staff developers in program planning and in developing comprehensive programs and courses in this area.

References

Arizona Department of Education (1990). *Bilingual and ESL program annual report, 1989-90.* Phoenix, Arizona: Author.

Borko, H. (1986). Clinical teacher education: The induction years. In J. V. Hoffman and S.A. Edwards (Eds.). *Reality and Reform in Clinical Teacher Education.* NY: Random House.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialling (1987). *CTC program standards.* Sacramento: Author.

CDE (1990a). *Bilingual education handbook: Designing instruction for LEP students.* Sacramento: Author.

CDE (1990b). *BICAL report.* Sacramento, CA: Author.

California Tomorrow (1990). *Embracing diversity: Teachers' voices from California's classrooms.* Los Angeles: Author.

Casteneda, L. V. (1991). Social organization of communication and interation in exemplary SAIP classrooms and the nature of competent membership. Paper presented at the annual American Educational Research Association meeting, Chicago.

Casteneda, L. V. (1992). *Improving programs of schools serving culturally and linguistically diverse student populations: A review of the literature.* Los Alamitos, CA: unpublished SWRL report.

Cummins, J. (1985). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for languge minority students. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework (pp. 3-50).* Sacramento: CDE.

Dianda, M. (1991). *New teachers in California's language-diverse metropolitan classrooms: Findings from an initial study.* Los Alamitos, CA: Unpublished SWRL report.

Green, J. S. (1986). Preparing for the year 2001 emergency challenges: Opportunities for renewal. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 123-128.

Hornberger, N.H. (1990). Creating successful learning contexts for bilingual literacy. *Teachers College Record*, 92, (2), 212-229.

National Association of State Boards of Education (1991). *The American tapestry: A guide to infusing multiculturalism into American education.* Alexandria, VA: NASBE.

Nevada Department of Education (1991). *1990-91 Nevada state annual LEP survey.* Carson City, NV: Author.

Nichols, P. C. (1989). Storytelling in Carolina: Contributions and contrasts. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 20, (3), 232.

Ramsey, P., Vold, E. B., & Williams, L. R. (1989). *Multicultural education: A sourcebook.* NY: Gardland Publications, Inc.

Sleeter, C.E.& Grant, C. A. (1987, November). An analysis of multicultural education in the U.S. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,*(4) , 210-215.

Smith, I.A., Anderson, S., & Sobul, D. (September/October 1991). UCLA moves to expand its response to the growing language diversity of area schools. *Bilingual Education Newsletter. 14,* 2, 1-5.

Te, H. D. (1992). *Newcomer students in California public schools.* Los Alamitos, CA : unpublished SWRL report.

Tikunoff, W. & Ward, B. A. (1991). *Modifying instructional environments: An overview of findings from the exemplary SAIP descriptive study.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

2/13/92

Figure 1.

Effective and Ineffective Instructional Strategies for Teaching Culturally Diverse Students

Effective	Ineffective
• Student-oriented	• Teacher-oriented
• Active student participation	• Passive reception of teacher talk
• Outcome focused	• Focus on delivery of instruction
• Language acquired in naturally occurring contexts	• Language learned in isolated contexts
• Emphasis on meaning and function	• Excessive emphasis on form
• Socially appropriate ways of communicating culture	• Superficial presentation of cultural issues and symbols
• Equal treatment and access for all to instruction for high level comprehension	• Use of differential content and teaching strategies based on ability or English language competence
• Cooperative learning in heterogeneous groups	• Individual learning/competition
• Use of manipulatives and realia to teach principles and concepts	• Exclusive focus on abstract rules and principles
• Basic and advanced skills and key concepts taught through meaningful tasks as the context for instruction	• "Basics" taught as isolated facts and discrete skills

Figure 2

Effective Instructional Features in Multiple Language Settings

- Teach actively
- Promote student involvement
- Communicate high expectations for success
- Use cooperative learning, heterogeneous groups
- Monitor student progress, provide feedback
- Mediate instruction for LEPs by using primary language (L1) and English (L2), and alternating between the two
- Use students' L1 to assist in building concepts and comprehension
- Provide content instruction through use of English language development strategies embedded into the curriculum
- Provide a balanced, integrated emphasis on English language development and subject matter content
- Integrate English language development with academic skills development
- Organize instruction to build upon structures from LEP students' home culture

Source: Tikunoff, 1985; Tikunoff & Ward, 1991

Figure 3.

Coursework Grid

COURSEWORK GRID

Institution: e.g., Arizona e.g., University

	ESL Specified	Bilingual/Target Language Instruction Specified	Multicultural/Diverse Populations		Content-area Instruction	Instructional Methods/Techniques	Instructional Materials	Assessment		Instructional Theory/Philosophy/Curriculum	Instructional Practicum/Field Experience	Instructional Lab./Observational Experience	Comments
Elementary/Secondary/Either 000													This is the course description.
Course ABC (Units: xx)	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	

Table 1

Percentage of Courses with Various Features
Los Angeles County Area

Feature/Focus	University of California Campuses	CSU Campuses	Private Universities	Overall Average Universities	County Office of Education
Content Area Instruction	.18	.23	.05	.15	.00
Instructional Methods	.71	.50	.40	.53	.50
ESL Methods	.39	.11	.19	.23	.00
Both Content and Instructional Methods	.12	.15	.00	.09	.00
Instructional Materials	.18	.21	.15	.18	.02
Assessment	.06	.11	.10	.09	.00
Instructional Theory/ Philosophy	.94	.93	.98	.95	.00
Field Experience or Lab	.20	.16	.29	.22	.00
Bilingual Education	.24	.41	.26	.30	.75
Multicultural/Diverse Populations	.55	.64	.69	.63	.25

Table 2

Percentage of Courses with Various Features, Arizona

Feature/Focus	University of Arizona, Tucson	Arizona State University	Northern Arizona University	Overall Average (3 Universities)
Content Area Instruction	.11	.24	.29	.21
Instructional Methods	.42	.55	.45	.47
ESL Methods	.05	.15	.18	.13
Both Content and Instructional Methods	.05	.09	.16	.09
Instructional Materials	.21	.09	.16	.15
Assessment	.11	.12	.13	.12
Instructional Theory/ Philosophy	.89	.88	.87	.88
Field Experience or Lab	.21	.15	.08	.15
Bilingual Education	.37	.70	.37	.48
Multicultural/Diverse Populations	.68	.55	.53	.59

Table 3

Percentage of Courses With Various Features
In Los Angeles County and Arizona

	Los Angeles County Average	Arizona Average
Instructional Theory/	95	88
Multicultural/Diverse Pop.	63	59
Instructional Methods	53	47
Bilingual Education	30	48
ESL Methods	23	13
Field Experience	22	15
Instructional Materials	18	15
Content Area Instruction	15	21
Content + Methods	9	9
Assessment	9	9